REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 17, 2004 and follows a personal interview between the Examiner and applicant's undersigned representative concerning various claims of record and art of record. The undersigned again thanks the Examiner for his time and consideration of the outstanding issues.

The present application contains claim 1, which stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gori (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,443) in view of DeMassi. (U.S. Patent No. 5,685,095).

The Drawings.

Fig. 4 has been amended to show the lateral restraint of a ski-lift chair, as referred to throughout the specification and to provide antecedent support for the lateral restraint of the claims. A marked-up version of Fig. 4 showing the proposed change is enclosed and approval is respectfully requested.

The Specification.

The specification has been amended to correct certain typographical errors and to include the reference number 35 for the lateral restraint.

The Claims.

Claim 1 has been cancelled.

New claims 2-11 have been added and are believed to be allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-4 each require that the length in the center section of the body member is greater than the length in either of the left or right outer sections. Claims 5-7 each require that the rear side of the body member is substantially straight and the front side is

nonstraight in that the maximum length of the left and right outer sections is less than the length of the central section. Claims 8-11 each require that the body member has a forwardly facing leading edge at its front side that is swept rearwardly along its width from the central section thereof to both left and right sides of said body member and has a rearward edge at its rear side that is substantially straight.

None of the art of record shows, describes or teaches the varying length (from front to back) of the body member of a display device nor provides any motivation to modify such dimension. Each of the devices of the cited references are directed to wholly different areas of use and recite no such variance or benefit that could be derived therefrom. For example, the advertisement display device of Gori is generally rectangular. Because the Gori device is directed to a grocery store cart, it is naturally compact and size dictates that the display area be maximized within the confines of the device. Thus, any reduction in the front to back dimension would be contrary to the need for ad space maximization.

Similarly, the Brookbank device is for a stationery chair and also recites no such front to back dimensional variance or benefit that could be derived therefrom.

The Thomas device is directed to a press button for a horn ring and shows a curvature along both the front and back edges, but that is dictated by the curvature of the steering wheel and horn ring. There is no recitation, teaching or motivation modify in Thomas to vary the radial dimensions (as viewed in Figs. 1 or 2).

Summary.

In view of the forgoing, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. All pending claims are believed allowable over the art of record, and action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The undersigned would welcome a

telephone call from the Examiner to discuss any outstanding issues in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Randall Frisk

Reg. No. 32,221

Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett

& Henry LLP

Bank One Center Tower

111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

(317) 634-3456

020178-000005.RRF:294539